



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Elaine Benson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/21/3284769

16 Redlake Drive, Pedmore DY9 0RX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Taj against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P21/1161, dated 9 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is new first floor extension to existing bungalow including single storey front & rear extensions, 2 storey side extension, new boundary wall, railings and gates and enlarged driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new first floor extension to existing bungalow including single storey front & rear extensions, 2 storey side extension, new boundary wall, railings and gates and enlarged driveway at 16 Redlake Drive, Pedmore DY9 0RX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P21/1161, dated 9 June 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: GD2267/03, GD2267/04, GD2267/05B, GD2267/06A and GD2267/08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. It is proposed to erect a second storey above a bungalow to form a house. The appearance of the existing property is unexceptional and it makes little contribution to the character of the area. As with other properties on the road, the bungalow is wide and occupies almost the whole width of the large plot. To the north of No 16 are single and 1.5 storey bungalows and opposite is a 1.5 storey recently modernised bungalow. The neighbouring property at No 18 is a

two-storey house. The individually designed detached bungalows and houses in the road are significantly sized.

4. The proposed development would extensively alter the appearance of the dwelling and its bulk and massing would be increased significantly. The external elevations would reflect materials found in the locality. The Council's design policies generally resist development that changes the character of a host property. However, notwithstanding that the appearance of the bungalow would change, within this varied context the proposed development would not appear incongruous and would respect local character, which is the primary aim of the policies and guidance. Under these specific circumstances, I find the extensions to be acceptable.
5. The Council raised no objections to the proposed front boundary treatment of low walls with railings above, having had regard to the permitted development fallback position and similar works being undertaken on neighbouring properties. In my judgement the proposed works would in keeping with the street scene and are acceptable.
6. For the foregoing reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would comply with the objectives of Policies S6 (Urban Design) and L1 (Housing Development, Extensions and Alteration to Existing Dwellings) of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy; the Council's Planning Guidance Note 17 - House Extension Design Guide; Black Country Core Strategy Policy ENV2 - Historic Character and Local Distinctiveness; and the requirement for high quality design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

7. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning I have identified the approved plans in a condition. A further condition is necessary which requires the use of matching materials in order to safeguard the appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR